

[Amendment
Serial No. 10/658,630

Docket 5000-1-447

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are rejected. Claim 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-12 are pending.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention. In response, applicants have amended the claims to correct the typographical error pointed out by the Examiner.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCorkle et al. (US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2003/0054764) in view of Koch et al. (US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2004/0033075). Similarly, claims 11-12 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch et al. (US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2003/0054764).

In response, applicants have amended base claim 1, 6 and 11 to more clearly define the fact that the UWB module is in the central office not the access point as shown in the prior art which allows for access points to be made in low and simple construction as disclosed in the specification, page 16, line 18.

Claim 1, as amended, now recites an indoor local area network (LAN) system comprising, *inter alia*, at least a first access point . . . wherein said access point does not include a UWB module. Similarly, claim 6, as amended recites a method of doing the same.

Claim 11, as amended, recites, an indoor LAN system comprising, *inter alia*, a central unit and a first, second and third access point, where the central unit includes a

[Amendment
Serial No. 10/658,630

Docket 5000-1-447

UWB module and the access points do not include a UWB module.

In contrast, McCorkle discloses the prior which shows a remote terminal with a UWB module. Therefore, McCorkle fails to teach or suggest an access point which does not include a UWB module as recited in all three base claims.

Regarding, Koch, that reference is primarily focused on PON and not wireless media. Therefore, Koch fails to suggest or teach UWB related technologies as recited in all three base claims where an access point does not include a UWB module.

Even if McCorkle and Koch were combine they still would not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in all three base claims where the **access point do not include a UWB module.**

Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of both obviousness rejections of base claims 1 and 6 and base claim 11.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Applicants would respectfully note for the record that Santhoff, US Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2006/0291536 cited in the instant office action was filed on August 28, 2006 and therefore post-dates the filing of the instant application which was filed on September 9, 2003 and claims priority to a Korean application filed May 20, 2003. Accordingly, Santhoff is not valid prior art in the instant case. Moreover, applicants note that since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

[Amendment
Serial No. 10/658,630

Docket 5000-1-447


For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

5/4/07

Steve S. Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
Cha & Reiter, LLC
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Telephone: (201) 226-9245
Facsimile: (201) 226-6246


By: Steve S. Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069